



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 14, 1998

No. 93

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Father, You have created us to love and praise You. You desire an intimate, personal relationship with all of us. Praise surges from our hearts for what You are to us and thanksgiving for what You promise for us. We say with the psalmist, "I will praise You, O Lord, with my whole heart. I will tell of Your marvelous works. I will be glad and rejoice in You; I will sing praise to Your name."—(Psalm 9:1-2). When we are yielded to You, our faltering, fallible human nature is invaded by Your problem-solving, uplifting presence. We want to glory only in our knowledge of You and Your wisdom. We commit our minds, emotions, wills, and bodies so that we may be used by You. Fill us with Your supernatural power so that we may be equipped to face the ups and downs, the pleasures and pressures of this day. We will remember that whatever the circumstances, praise and thanksgiving will usher us into Your heart where alone we can find the guidance and grace we so urgently need. You have given the day; now show the way. Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this morning, under a previous order, the Senate will debate the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the Daschle

amendment, with a vote occurring on the motion at 10 a.m.

Following that vote, the Senate will continue consideration of the very important agriculture appropriations bill, with the hope of finishing the bill as soon as possible this evening, or as early as possible this week. And I am very proud that my senior colleague from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN, will be doing his usual very good job in handling this important bill. Therefore, Members should expect rollcall votes throughout today's session of the Senate, with the first vote at 10 a.m.

For the remainder of the week, it is hoped the Senate will complete several important appropriations bills—at least agriculture, HUD-VA, and legislative. That would be a very positive movement and would give us an opportunity to address other important issues.

Members are reminded that we have the second in the Leader Lecture series this evening. I will be honored to introduce our former majority leader, Senator Baker. That will be held tonight at 6 p.m. in the old Senate Chamber.

Also, on Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock, there will be a Joint Meeting of Congress in the House Chamber to receive an address from the President of Romania.

I urge my colleagues to come to our lecture series session this afternoon with Senator Baker. I know it will be interesting and, as usual, filled with good wit and good humor, and will be very informative about his views of the Senate and where we have been and where we are going. The next speaker in the leader series is scheduled to be Senator BYRD of West Virginia. I believe it is in September.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wonder if the leader would yield for a question.

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. I was listening to the leader's outline for the remainder of

the week and the proposals, and I had not heard the scheduling of the Patients' Bill of Rights. I know that the leader talked with the Democratic leader. I was wondering if he could give us any further information about what the scheduling prospects would be for that very important piece of legislation, particularly since the HUD appropriations has that as an amendment on it. What could the leader tell us about the prospects of going to a debate on this legislation?

Mr. LOTT. I have been indicating all year that the Senate was going to take this issue up, and beginning June 18 I sent suggested unanimous consent agreements to Senator DASCHLE. He and I talked yesterday. We are working together on that issue. We fully expect that probably early next week we will turn to this issue. We have not worked out the exact time or the exact procedure. But we had a good discussion yesterday, and we will continue to have that discussion.

I would like for us to do it where we have the Patients' Bill of Rights as the issue that is pending, with Senator KENNEDY's bill as one of those, obviously, that would be offered, and the task force bill that has been put together by Senator NICKLES, and others, and not tie up appropriations bills. We have the people's work to do. The appropriations bills keep the Government running. They fund our farm programs, they fund our veterans programs, they fund our housing programs, they fund our parks and Interior, Commerce, State, and Justice. The Senator knows the list. So we need to go ahead with those appropriations bills, and then we will turn to the Patients' Bill of Rights in a reasonable period of time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed with my leader time so that I can make a statement with regard to the committee hearings on the investigation with regard to the satellite exports to the People's Republic of China.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S8087

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SATELLITE EXPORTS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am going to provide an update on the investigations that have been proceeding by four of our committees into this U.S. policy toward satellite exports. We have not reached any final determinations. I want to emphasize that. The good counsel is that we have made some progress. We are learning some things, but there is a good deal more work that needs to be done. I believe the Intelligence Committee has an open hearing scheduled tomorrow. Senator COCHRAN's subcommittee has hearings scheduled I believe next week. So we will continue this. We are going to be thorough and we are going to be cautious. We should not jump to conclusions.

In this connection, I recently came across the following statement from 1989 concerning the Bush administration's decision to allow export licenses for three United States satellites: "Allowing these launches is not in the best interests of our country or of our relationship with China. It casts a long shadow that distorts beyond recognition what the United States ought to represent to our own people and to the people fighting for democracy in China." This statement was made by then-Senator AL GORE. He obviously has changed his position.

What we have to examine is whether the policy of allowing the export of U.S. satellites as implemented by the Clinton-Gore administration adequately protects American national interests.

Let me start with the bottom line. Senate investigations have only begun. Lack of cooperation from the Administration has hampered our efforts. Thirteen hearings with 32 witnesses have been held by four committees. I have met with the committee chairmen and other members of our informal task force on China. At this point, five major interim judgments can be made based on what we already know.

First, the Clinton administration's export controls for satellites are wholly inadequate. They have not protected sensitive U.S. technology. National security concerns are regularly downplayed and even ignored.

Second, in violation of stated United States policy, sensitive technology related to satellite exports has been transferred to China. We know what the case is.

Third, China has received military benefit from United States satellite exports.

Every day, there continues to be additional information that comes out in this area.

In fact, in today's Washington Times, there is a news article that says "U.S. Technology Builds 'Bridge' for China Missile."

Fourth, the administration has ignored overwhelming information regarding Chinese proliferation, and has embarked on a de facto policy designed to protect China and U.S. satellite companies from sanctions under U.S. proliferation law. We have a statement from White House official to that effect.

Finally, new information has come to light about China's efforts to influence the American political process. This new information should remove all resistance to naming an independent counsel to investigate the evidence and the allegations.

The administration has failed to fully cooperate with the Senate investigation, even though they have indicated that they would, and there is still time for that. But on May 22, 1998, along committee chairmen of jurisdiction, I sent letters requesting administration documents from the White House, the Departments of State, Commerce, Defense, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. On June 1, 1998, a letter was sent to the Department of Justice requesting documents. On June 2, 1998, a letter was sent requesting documents from the Customs Service. On June 12, 1998, Senators SHELBY and KERREY sent letters requesting information from eight Governmental agencies and the White House as part of the Select Committee on Intelligence investigation.

The letters I joined in sending requested documents in three areas: First, all issues associated with the export of satellites to China, including waivers of U.S. law governing such exports and the decision to transfer control of satellite exports from the Department of State to the Department of Commerce; second, issues associated with China's proposed membership in the Missile Technology Control Regime, MTCR; and third, information on Chinese proliferation activities which indicate possible violations of U.S. laws.

A significant amount of documents have been provided concerning some areas of satellite exports—particularly from the White House and particularly on the presidential waivers allowing satellite exports. But virtually no information has been provided concerning the transfer of export controls from State to Commerce—from the White House or any other agency. And virtually no information has been provided on Chinese membership in the MTCR, or on Chinese proliferation activities in violation of U.S. law.

A review of executive branch compliance with our document requests demonstrates how limited the cooperation really has been.

Until Friday of last week, the Department of Commerce only provided an initial limited set of documents. More has been promised, but the response has again glacial and incomplete. The documents they have provided contain redactions that limit their utility, quite frankly.

The Department of Justice has provided nothing to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, and has insisted on reviewing virtually all documents provided by any other Government agencies—significantly slowing down the process in this area.

The Department of State has provided also virtually nothing. Classified documents, according to a July 2, 1998, letter, would not be provided to the Congress. Instead, documents could be read only at the Department of State. Given that far more sensitive information is routinely provided for the use of the Senate in Senate spaces, this can only be seen as bureaucratic obstruction.

The White House has not responded to the Intelligence Committee. Neither has ACDA, Customs, or State. Defense and Commerce have only provided limited information.

The White House initially declassified some documents concerning waiver decisions in June, but has provided nothing since then.

The Department of Defense has provided only a very limited number of documents.

The Customs Service has provided nothing other than a June 23, 1998, letter stating that they would not meet our June 15, 1998, deadline, but we haven't gotten that information as of yet.

After a review of the Clinton administration's compliance with our requests for information, it is hard to escape the conclusion that delay has become the standard operating procedure. Once again, it is going to make it difficult for us to get the information we need so we can make a clear determination about the damage that has been done with this technology transfer. After an initial show of good faith by the administration, we have not had a lot more cooperation since then.

We will be forced to consider other measures to compel enforcement. I don't plan to move nominees of these non-cooperative agencies until our legitimate oversight requests are honored. We are actively examining the possibility of subpoena options. It is becoming increasingly difficult to continue with the very productive hearings that we have had without this cooperation.

Now, I would like to address the five points I raised earlier in some greater detail. Again, these are preliminary conclusions and we are seeking additional information.

First, the Clinton administration's export controls for satellites are simply inadequate. There has not been adequate protection of sensitive U.S. technology. National security concerns are regularly downplayed and even ignored. Hearings before several committees have detailed the shortcomings in the development and implementation of export controls of satellites.

For example, a senior official of the Defense Trade and Security Administration testified before the Committee